



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,170	01/14/2000	Suresh Venkatraman	MFCP.68209	8035

7590

05/05/2003

Mauricio A Uribe
Shook Hardy & Bacon LLP
One Kansas City Place
1200 Main Street
Kansas City, MO 64105-2118

EXAMINER

HOANG, PHUONG N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2003

5

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/483,170

Applicant(s)

VENKATRAMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Phuong N. Hoang

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 33 – 35, 37 – 41, 43, and 50 – 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atsushi Kanamori, U.S. patent no. 5,754,854.

As to claim 33, Kanamori teaches a central data server (transferee program 321, col. 5, lines 52 – 65), central data store (operating system 240, col. 5, lines 12 – 30), client application (spreadsheet or graphing program, col. 1 lines 15 – 20), system resource data (global shared resource, col. 4, lines 35 – 45 and col. 5, lines 15 – 30), an update communications server (transferor program, col. 5, lines 62 – 66).

Central data server of Kanamori is connected to the central data store. It would have been obvious to make it to be a communication link between said central data store and client applications because the central data server is one of the communicating programs (col. 1 lines 15 – 20).

As to claim 34, Kanamori teaches font resource data (fonts, col. 5, lines 45 – 52).

As to claim 35, it would have been obvious to make the Kanamori's central data server to be central font cache server because it also contains font resources.

As to claim 37, it would have been obvious to make the update communication server to be a font cache update window because it also contains font resources.

As to claim 38, Kanamori teaches obtaining a copy of resource data (copies the contents of global resource, col. 4, lines 35 – 45), receiving data process request (receives the request for data, col. 1, lines 48 – 50), sharing the copy of the resource data (access to the proxies of shared resource, col. 4, lines 35 – 45 and col. 5 lines 35 – 45), and communicating the processed resource data requests to the respective applications (directs data to the transferee program, col. 5, lines 55 – 60).

As to claim 39, Kanamori teaches creating an instance of a central server (transferee program 321, col. 5, lines 52 – 65).

It would have been obvious to have instructions so the system can run the transferee program.

As to claim 40, see claim 35 above.

As to claim 41, Kanamori teaches creating an instance of a central data store (create when operating system 240 runs, col. 5, lines 12 – 30) storing the resource data.

As to claim 43, Kanamori teaches transferring the data requests to the data store (transferor and transferee access to operating system, col. 2 lines 15 – 20).

As to claim 50, see claim 34 above.

As to claim 51 and 52, Kanamori teaches single document interface applications (spreadsheet or graphing program, col. 1 lines 15 – 20).

As to claim 53, It would have been obvious to make single document interface applications are created from a single software platform because nowadays software technology can provide this capability.

As to claim 54, Kanamori teaches a computer system (computer system 200, col. 5 lines 10 – 20) having memory (memory 230, col. Lines 10 – 20), an operating system (operating system 240, col. Lines 10 – 20), and a central processor (it is inherent in a computer system).

2. Claims 1 - 8, 13 - 18, 36, 42, 44, 45 are are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atsushi Kanamori, U.S. patent no. 5,754,854, and further in view of Jon Franklin Matousek, U.S. patent no. 5,706,462.

As to claim 1, see claim 38 above. Further, Kanamori teaches storing a shared copy of resource data (proxy resource, col. 4 lines 35 – 45 and col. 5 lines 35 - 45).

Kanamori does not explicitly teach the resources to be utilized by the two or more applications.

Matousek teaches the resources to be shared by two or more applications (interaction between application programs and the operating system involves the function calls and responses related to fonts and text output, col. 9 lines 5 – 10).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Matousek to Kanamori's system because they both teach resource management.

As to claim 2, see claim 39 above.

As to claim 3, see claim 40 above.

As to claim 4, see claim 41 above.

As to claim 6, see claim 43 above.

As to claim 13 – 16, see claim 50 – 53 respectively.

As to claim 18, see claim 1, 13, and 15 above.

As to claim 36, Matousek teaches font data store (font width cache, col. 13, lines 5 - 10).

It would have been obvious to make the Kanamori's central data store to be central font cache server because they are also font resources.

As to claim 42 and 5, see claim 36 above.

As to claim 17, Matousek teaches instructions (instructions, col. 8, lines 45 – 65).

It would have been obvious to make the Kanamori's system to have the instructions so it can carries out all the implementations.

As to claim 7 and 44, Kanamori as modified teaches transferring at least a portion of the resource data fro the data store to the respective applications (see

Art Unit: 2126

Matousek, operating system 30 to perform all of the steps required to accomplish various tasks, such as displaying text on the monitor 25, col. 8 lines 60 – 65 and col. 9 lines 26 – 50).

As to claim 8 and 45, Kanamori teaches a fast access array (Each font width cache 600 includes three hash tables, U+FFFF hex, col. 16 lines 8 – 16).

3. Claims 9 – 12, 19 – 32, and 46 – 49 are are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atsushi Kanamori, U.S. patent no. 5,754,854, in view of Jon Franklin Matousek, U.S. patent no. 5,706,462, and further in view of Vlad Bril, U.S. patent no. 5,539,428.

As to claim 46, Bril teaches refreshing the resource data (update the fonts (col. 7, lines 50 – 67).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Bril to Kanamori's system to share the updated resources.

As to claim 47, see claim 33 and 37 above. Further, Bril teaches obtaining a new copy of the resource data (load a new font, col. 7 lines 50 – 55).

It would have been ob obvious to apply the teaching of Bril to Kanamori's system to share the updated resources.

As to claim 48, Bril teaches receiving an update resource data (updated, col. 7, lines 60 – 63).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Bril to Kanamori's system to share the updated resources.

As to claim 49, Bril teaches update font resource (updated with new fonts, col. 7, lines 60 – 63).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Bril to Kanamori's system to share the updated resources.

As to claim 9 – 12, see claim 46 – 49 respectively.

As to claim 19 – 21, see claim 9 – 11 respectively.

As to claim 22, see claim 47 above.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art understand that it needs to get the commands from the application for acquiring a new copy of font resource data.

As to claim 23, see claim 4 and 5 above.

As to claim 24, see claim 2 and 14 above.

As to claim 25, see claim 1 and 6.

As to claim 26, see claim 7 above.

As to claim 27, see claim 8 above.

As to claim 28, Kanamori teaches system handle (handle, col. 5, lines 64 – 67).

As to claim 29, see claim 15 above.

As to claim 30, see claim 16 above.

As to claim 31, see claim 17 above.

As to claim 32, see claim 54 above.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 1/14/00 have been fully considered but not persuasive.

Applicant argued that reference in claims 1, 18, 33, and 38 does not teach sharing resources without creating multiple copies of the same resource data (page 4 paragraph 4), minimizing the duplication of resource data (page 5 paragraph 5), central data store utilizes a fast access array (p. 5 paragraph 3), central data server of applicant's invention "acquires resource data from the central data store when requested by a client", the data is processed by an update server, clients in the invention receive the processed data rather than copies of the requested resource data as in Kanamori. Even further, it would not have been obvious nor suggested by the teachings of Kanamori to process the data and send out the results, applicant's invention provides constrained computer memory usage by not creating multiple copies of the same resource data (page 6, first paragraph). References in claims 5, 17, 36, and 42 do not provide all of the elements of the claimed invention, no motivation to combine Matousek with Kanamori (page 6 second paragraph). Bril is not analogous art to Kanamori in claims 9-12, 19, 32, and 46-49. References do not "providing cached font information back to individual applications or clients as a shared resource", (page 7, third paragraph).

In response, examiner did not see where applicant claimed sharing resources without creating multiple copies of the same resource data. This conflicted with “minimizing the duplication of resource data”. Examiner sees applicant claimed “copy of the resource data”, and reference meets that limitation. Claims 1,18,33 and 38 do not claim a fast access array. However, this limitation is still met by Matousek (each font width cache includes three hash tables, U+FFF hex, col. 16 lines 7 - 18). Again, examiner did not see where applicant claimed central data server “acquires resource data from the central data store when requested by a client”, “the data is processed by an update server”, “clients in the invention receive the processed data”, “process the data and send out the results”, “provides constrained computer memory usage by not creating multiple copies of the same resource data”.

Applicant made a statement that references do not provide all of the elements of the claimed invention, but failed to point out what element(s) was/were missed.

Applicant's invention is about resource sharing. Matousek, Kanamori, and Bril all directed to resource management. Therefore, it is analogous art.

Kanamori modified by Matousek teaches transferring the resource data from the data store to the applications (see Matousek, operating system 30 to perform all of the steps required to accomplish various tasks, such as displaying text on the monitor 25, col. 8 lines 60 – 65 and col. 9 lines 26 – 50).

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong N. Hoang whose telephone number is (703) 605-4239. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alvin Oberley can be reached on (703)305-9716. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)746-7239 for regular communications and (703)746-7238 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/483,170

Page 11

Art Unit: 2126

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)746-7140.

ph
May 2, 2003

Sue Lao